

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Scott C. Koss

Confirmation No.: 2514

Serial No.: 09/784,227

Examiner: Eron J. Sorrell

Filed: February 13, 2001

Group Art Unit: 2182

For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR A GENERIC PROCESSING DEVICE CLIENT

Date this paper submitted: March 27, 2007

Mail Stop Issue Fee

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**APPLICANT'S COMMENTS
RELATED TO
EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT AND
REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE DATED 1/10/07**

This submission is responsive to the Notice of Allowance and the Examiner's Amendment which is attached to the Notice of Allowance, Paper No. 20061222, dated January 10, 2007.

Applicant thanks the examiner for the telephone conference and interview conducted on 12 December 2006 and for the examiner's amendment dated January 10, 2007.

Applicant would like to make of record the fact that the grammatical changes to the claims agreed to with the examiner and documented in the examiner's amendment dated January 10, 2007, were made as matters of form and they were not made to substantively change the scope of the claims to avoid prior art.

It is also noted that the examiner's amendment replaces the previous paragraph 30 with a new paragraph 30.

The previous paragraph 30, which was eliminated by the examiner, states:

“Thus, although there has been described to this point a particular embodiment for a method and apparatus for a generic document processing client, it is not intended that such specific references be considered as limitations upon the scope of this invention except in-so-far as set forth in the following claims”.

Since, the above paragraph is merely a statement of what is in fact the law, and in order to avoid any delay in the issuance of this patent, applicant agrees to the replacement for paragraph 30 as done by the examiner's amendment. The elimination of the prior language was not done to change or limit what was previously disclosed in the patent application.

In the new paragraph added by the examiner, it is noted that the examiner states that: “Some sort of computer readable storage medium, such as a CD-Rom or a diskette, will contain the code.” Applicant notes that the examples given are not to be taken as limiting and the code can be contained on any type of “computer readable storage medium”.

Applicant also notes that the paragraph added by the examiner goes on to state that “The software code may also take the form of a downloadable file, or print driver.” Applicant agrees with this statement and the statement is consistent with what was disclosed in the patent application when initially filed.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,
MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Elmer W. Galbi
Reg. No. 19,761

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 222-3613
E-mail: elmer@techlaw.com